



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,543	09/23/2003	Jean-Philippe Wary	704-011490-US(PAR)	2120
7590 PERMAN & GREEN, LLP 425 Post Road Fairfield, CT 06824	05/29/2007		EXAMINER BENGZON, GREG C	
			ART UNIT 2144	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/668,543	WARY, JEAN-PHILIPPE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Greg Bengzon	2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/23/2003.
 - 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 - 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 - 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 1-18 are pending.

Priority

This application claims benefits of priority from Foreign Application 0211803 (FRANCE) filed September 24, 2002.

The effective date of the claims described in this application is September 24, 2002.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 09/23/2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Method steps critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Claims 1-18 are directed to a method with no indicated method steps.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Claims 1-18 are directed to a method with no indicated method steps.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5-9,11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5-9,11 are directed to a method with a 'preferred' limitation. The term "preferably" in Claims 5-9,11 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "preferable" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-18 are directed towards a method for creating a data structure. A process consisting solely of mathematical operations, i.e., converting one set of numbers into another set of numbers, does not manipulate appropriate subject matter and thus cannot constitute a statutory process.

Furthermore data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. Mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data, without any functional interrelationship is not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.

Specification

A preliminary examination of this application reveals that it includes terminology which is so different from that which is generally accepted in the art to which this invention pertains that a proper search of the prior art cannot be made. For example: 'NDS field, defined in the telephony standard' is not widely used in the art. (see Applicant Abstract)

The Examiner has performed several preliminary searches on this term and is not able to ascertain the meaning of the term 'NDS field' and the telephony standard being referred to.

Applicant is required to provide a clarification of these matters or correlation with art-accepted terminology so that a proper comparison with the prior art can be made. Applicant should be careful not to introduce any new matter into the disclosure (i.e., matter which is not supported by the disclosure as originally filed).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this letter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asokan (US Patent 6959009) in view of what was obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Asokan disclosed (re. Claim 1) a method for the production, by a service provider, of a first multimedia user isolating identifier (Asokan-Column 8 Lines 40-45) compatible with the identifiers of a telephony network wherein: the first identifier has a maximum size of 15 digits, (Asokan- Column 14 Lines 10-15, 'MSISDN'), the first identifier has at least one productive digit making it possible to designate the producer of the identifier, (Asokan-Column 3 Lines 20, 'NSAPI', Column 7 Lines 5-10, 'network prefix') the first identifier has at least one nature-defining digit enabling the nature of the first identifier to be defined (Asokan-Column 7 Lines 45-50), the first identifier has N

identifying digits enabling the designation of the user, the first identifier has M variability digits depending on the nature-defining digit.

The Examiner notes that Asokan is directed towards the same issues for which the claimed invention is intended, namely preventing loss of privacy in mobile networks. (Asokan-Column 8 Lines 50-60) In Asokan, MSISDN together with the NSAPI provide a unique identifier for mobile users to identify the mobile user to the gateway for signaling and data transmission. The unique identifier is generated by either at the mobile node or at the gateway node.

Asokan disclosed (re. Claim 2) wherein a digit is a representation, in data processing, that enables the encoding of a decimal number. (Asokan- Column 14 Lines 10-15, 'MSISDN')

Asokan disclosed (re. Claim 3) wherein a digit is a representation, in data processing, that enables the encoding of a hexadecimal number. (Asokan- Column 14 Lines 10-15, 'MSISDN')

Asokan disclosed (re. Claim 4) wherein the identifier digits correspond to a telephone number of the user. (Asokan-Column 8 Lines 40-45)

Asokan disclosed (re. Claim 5) wherein the identifier digits (Asokan- Column 14 Lines 10-15, 'MSISDN') are preferably the digits 8 to 15, N being then equal to 8; (re. Claim 6) wherein the producer digit (Asokan-Column 3 Lines 20, 'NSAPI', Column 7 Lines 5-10, '*network prefix*') is preferably the digit 1; (re. Claim 7) wherein the nature-defining digit (Asokan-Column 3 Lines 20, 'NSAPI', Column 7 Lines 5-10, '*network prefix*') is preferably the digit numbered 2.

The Examiner notes that Claims 5 thru 7 are describing an arrangement of data for the identifiers already discussed in Claim 1. There can be no patentable weight given to the arrangement of data being claimed, hence only the functionality produced by or derived from the said data structure is being examined. Since Asokan disclosed the producer digit (Asokan-Column 3 Lines 20, 'NSAPI', Column 7 Lines 5-10, '*network prefix*') and the nature-defining digit (Asokan-Column 7 Lines 45-50), then Asokan is deemed to disclose Claims 5-7 accordingly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asokan (US Patent 6959009) in view of what was obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner notes that Claims 8-10 are describing an arrangement of data for the identifiers already discussed in Claim 1. There can be no patentable weight given to the arrangement of data being claimed, hence only the functionality produced or derived the said data structure is being examined.

While Asokan substantially disclosed the invention, Asokan did not disclose (re. Claim 8 wherein the M digits, preferably the digits numbered 2 to 7, enable the encoding of a date.

The combination of Asokan and what was obvious in the network art disclosed (re. Claim 8) enable the encoding of a date.

At the time of the invention it would have been well-known in the network art to encode a date within a data structure for identifying a subscriber. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable a temporary or dynamically generated identifier to be identified as obsolete.

The combination of Asokan and what was obvious in the network art disclosed (re. Claim 9) wherein the M digits, preferably the digits numbered 2 to 7, enabling the encoding of a date in the month/day/time (mmddhh) format.

At the time of the invention it would have been well-known in the network art to encode a date following standard date formats such as month/day/time (mmddhh) format. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable a temporary or dynamically generated identifier to be identified as obsolete.

The combination of Asokan and what was obvious in the network art disclosed (re. Claim 10) wherein a value of 0 or 1 for the digit numbered 2 corresponds to a temporary identifier. (Asokan-Column 3 Lines 50-55)

The Examiner notes that Claim 10 is describing a mathematical value for the identifiers already discussed in Claim 1. There can be no patentable weight given to the mathematical value being claimed, hence only the functionality produced by the said

data structure is being examined. Since Asokan disclosed a temporary identifier (Asokan-Column 3 Lines 50-55) then Asokan disclosed Claim 10 accordingly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-14, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asokan (US Patent 6959009) in view of what was obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art further in view of Brainard (US Patent 6985583).

While Asokan substantially disclosed the invention Asokan did not disclose (re. Claim 11) wherein the M digits, preferably the digits numbered 2 to 7, represent the period of time that has elapsed since the beginning of the year in progress, expressed in 1/900,000th fractions.

The Examiner notes that Claim 11 is describing an arrangement of data for the identifiers already discussed in Claim 1. There can be no patentable weight given to the arrangement of data being claimed, hence only the functionality produced or derived the said data structure is being examined.

Brainard disclosed (re. Claim 11) representing the period of time that has elapsed since the beginning of the year in progress, expressed in 1/900,000th fractions. (Brainard-Column 8 Lines 20-25)

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Brainard into Asokan. The motivation for said combination would have been to create an identifier containing time-related information that cannot be determined from the resulting identifier. (Brainard-Column 2 Lines 15-20)

Asokan-Brainard disclosed (re. Claim 12,14) wherein a value of 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 for the digit numbered 2 corresponds to a temporary identifier. (Asokan-Column 3 Lines 50-55)

The Examiner notes that Claim 12 is describing a mathematical value for the identifiers already discussed in Claim 11. There can be no patentable weight given to the mathematical value being claimed, hence only the functionality produced by the said data structure is being examined. Since Asokan disclosed a temporary identifier (Asokan-Column 3 Lines 50-55) then Asokan disclosed Claim 12 accordingly.

Asokan-Brainard disclosed (re. Claim 13) wherein the M digits, preferably the digits numbered 2 to 7, represent the period of time that has elapsed since the beginning of the year in progress, expressed in 1/800, 000th fractions. (Brainard-Column 2 Lines 15-20)

Asokan-Brainard disclosed (re. Claim 17) wherein the identifier digits and the variability digits are encrypted. (Brainard- Column 2 Lines 20-30)

Asokan-Brainard disclosed (re. Claim 18) wherein the encryption algorithm is symmetrical and produces digits. (Brainard- Column 2 Lines 20-30)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asokan (US Patent 6959009) in view of what was obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art further in view of Ginzboorg (US Patent 6240091).

The Examiner notes that Claim 15 are describing an arrangement of data for the identifiers already discussed in Claim 1. There can be no patentable weight given to the arrangement of data being claimed, hence only the functionality produced or derived

the said data structure is being examined.

While Asokan substantially disclosed the invention Asokan did not disclose (re. Claim 15) wherein the M variability digits enable the identification of a content provider.

Ginzboorg disclosed (re. Claim 15) enabling the identification of a content provider. (Ginzboorg- Column 8 Lines 15-30)

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the networking art to combine Ginzboorg into Asokan. The motivation for said combination would have been to differentiate between the private usage and business usage of the mobile subscriber (Ginzboorg-Column 3 Lines 35-40).

Asokan-Ginzboorg disclosed (re. Claim 16) identifying of a contract between the user and the service provider. (Ginzboorg- Column 8 Lines 15-30)

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part

Art Unit: 2144

of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to the enclosed PTO-892 form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Bengzon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3944. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571)272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

gcb



WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

